arXiv:1403.5960v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 24 Mar 2014

A recent quantum canonical ensemble based on a suggestion by Schrödinger produces non-extensive thermodynamic functions

J. L. Alonso[1,2,3], A. Castro[4,5], J. Clemente-Gallardo [1,2,3,5], J. C. Cuchí[6], P. Echenique-Robba[7,2,1,5,3], J. G. Esteve[1,2] and F. Falceto[1,2]

[1]Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad de Zaragoza, Pedro Cerbuna 12, E-50009 Zaragoza, Spain
[2]Instituto de Biocomputación y Física de Sistemas Complejos (BIFI), Universidad de Zaragoza, Mariano Esquillor s/n, Edificio I+D, E-50018 Zaragoza, Spain
[3]Unidad Asociada IQFR-BIFI,Edificio I+D-Campus Río Ebro, Mariano Esquillor s/n, 50018 Zaragoza (SPAIN)
[4]BIFI-Fundación ARAID, Universidad de Zaragoza, Edificio I+D-Campus Río Ebro, Mariano Esquillor s/n, 50018 Zaragoza (SPAIN)
[5]Zaragoza Scientific Center for Advanced Modelling (ZCAM), Universidad de Zaragoza, Edificio I+D-Campus Río Ebro, Mariano Esquillor s/n, 50018 Zaragoza (SPAIN)
[6]Departament d'Enginyeria Agroforestal, ETSEA-Universitat de Lleida, Av. Alcalde Rovira Roure 191, 25198 Lleida, Spain
[7]Instituto de Química Física Rocasolano, CSIC, Serrano 119, E-28006 Madrid, Spain

Abstract. In a note to the second edition of his book on statistical thermodynamics, Schrödinger suggests that thermodynamical functions cannot be based on the gratuitous allegation that quantum-mechanical levels (typically the orthogonal eigenstates of the Hamiltonian operator) are the only allowed states for the quantum system. Different authors have interpreted this statement by introducing density distributions on the space of quantum pure states with weights obtained as functions of the expectation value of the Hamiltonian of the system.

In this work we focus on one of the best known of these distributions, and we prove that, when considered on composite quantum systems, it defines partition functions which do not factorize as products of partition functions of the noninteracting subsystems, even in the thermodynamical regime. This implies that it is not possible to define extensive thermodynamical magnitudes such as the free energy, the internal energy or the thermodynamic entropy by using these models. Therefore, we conclude that this distribution inspired by Schrödinger's idea can not be used to construct an appropriate quantum equilibrium thermodynamics, even if it may have interesting applications in non-equilibrium situations.

1. Introduction

In a note to the second edition of his book on statistical thermodynamics [1], Schrödinger suggests that thermodynamical functions cannot be based on the gratuitous allegation that quantum-mechanical levels (typically the orthogonal eigenstates of the Hamiltonian operator) are the only allowed states in statistical thermodynamics. In Khinchin's classical book on the mathematical foundations of quantum statistics (sec. 2 of chap III of [2]) an approach to microcanonical averages is proposed in line with Schrödinger's suggestion. Landau and Lifshitz [3] also consider unrealistic the possibility of preparing isolated macroscopic physical systems in a precise energy eigenstate, since energy levels are too close to each other to select just one.

From these points of view, it seems then natural to consider the description of quantum statistical systems as probability densities defined on the space of physical states. This description offers the possibility of considering properties of each physical state, such as its weight in the ensemble, in an analogue manner to what it is done when describing classical statistical systems. The approach also offers many advantages in the description of hybrid quantum-classical systems, as it can be seen in [4, 5]. Nonetheless, it is important to keep in mind that these distributions are ambiguous from the physical point of view. Indeed, it is well known since von Neumann [6] that the physical properties of a quantum system are encoded univocally in its density matrix $\hat{\rho}$, but there are many different equivalent expressions for $\hat{\rho}$ as a sum of pure states (projectors). Therefore, we may define entirely different distributions on the space of states, which nevertheless are equivalent because they lead to the same density matrix.

In Refs. [7, 8, 9] Brody et al, propose their quantum microcanonical postulate which asserts that every quantum state possessing the same energy expectation value must be realized democratically. Brody and coworkers also introduce an alternative quantum canonical distribution and study some of its properties. The distribution is defined as a density on the space of pure quantum states which assigns to each state the Boltzmann weight associated to the expectation value of the Hamiltonian. These ideas have been adopted with different degrees of intensity by several authors in the last years using even different distributions (see Refs. [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19] for some examples). In this work we will focus on the particular state-space distribution introduced in Refs. [7, 8, 9, 10, 11] and, following Jona-Lasinio and Presilla, we will refer to it as the Schrödinger-Gibbs (SG) distribution. Despite its possible usefulness for some applications and their a priori appeal, however, a crucial result of this construction is that, as suggested by Fig. 2 of Ref. [7], the third law of thermodynamics may not be satisfied. Therefore it is desirable to know why this happens and whether some other essential properties of the equilibrium thermodynamics, such as the definition of consistent extensive magnitudes, is maintained when using the new SG distribution.

In this work we prove that, when considered on composite noninteracting quantum systems, this distribution defines partition functions which do not factorize as products of partition functions of the subsystems, even in the thermodynamical regime. This implies that it is not possible to define extensive thermodynamical magnitudes such as the free energy, the internal energy or the thermodynamic entropy by using these models. Therefore, although Schrödinger's suggestion might seem reasonable a priori and it could have interesting dynamical features (as can be learned from

some of the references above), it cannot be used to construct an appropriate quantum thermodynamics; at least not if the suggestion is materialized in the form of the SG distribution.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2.1 we review the traditional canonical distribution as well as the new SG distribution, and we discuss the different alternative forms to present them. Section 2.2 studies the quantum properties associated to the density matrix that encodes the properties of the SG distribution, in particular that it commutes with the Hamiltonian. Section 2.3 and Section 2.4 contain the main result of the paper: we prove that the partition function of the new quantum ensemble does not factorize in the case of composite noninteracting systems. In Section 3 we present a simple model to exemplify our analysis, and discuss it from several points of view. Namely, we evaluate the partition function, the possible definitions of thermodynamic extensive magnitudes, and an alternative description in terms of density matrices. In both approaches we identify the lack of factorizability and its cause: basically, that the density matrix associated to the SG distribution represents an entangled state. Finally, in the Conclusions, we briefly summarize the content of the paper and consider the potential impact of our analysis on the study of the equilibrium and non-equilibrium statistics of hybrid quantum-classical systems.

2. On the traditional and the new quantum canonical ensembles

2.1. Description of the ensembles

Consider a physical system on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ of dimension n. We define the dynamics by a Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$. In this context, the traditional Quantum Canonical Ensemble (QCE, see standard textbooks such as Ref. [6, 20, 21, 22] for the details) is the ensemble defined by the density matrix

$$\hat{\rho}_C = Z^{-1} \exp(-\beta \hat{H}), \tag{1}$$

where the partition function Z is defined as

$$Z = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\exp(-\beta \hat{H})\right). \tag{2}$$

One may alternatively arrive to ensemble definitions by establishing first a probability distribution $F(|\psi\rangle)$ on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with respect to the canonical volume element $d\mu(|\psi\rangle)$, or equivalently, a probability distribution $F(P_\psi)$ on the projective space $\mathcal{PH}$, where P_ψ is the one-dimensional projector onto the state ψ. These distributions can then be used to define the ensembles, i.e., to construct the density matrices: given any probability distribution F defined on state space, the corresponding density matrix is given by:

$$\hat{\rho} = \int_{\mathcal{PH}} d\mu(P_\psi) F(P_\psi) P_\psi. \tag{3}$$

where $d\mu$ represents an invariant measure on $\mathcal{PH}$. Different distributions F and F' may lead to the same density matrix, and must then be considered equivalent. This is just reflecting on the well known ambiguity in the definition of a density matrix: given a density matrix $\hat{\rho}$, there are infinitely many ways of writting it as a convex combination of rank-one projectors.

One may now prove that the average value of an arbitrary quantum observable $\hat{O}$, can be calculated as (see [5])

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{PH}} d\mu(P_\psi) F(P_\psi) O(P_\psi). \tag{4}$$

where $O(P_\psi) = \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{O}P_\psi) = \frac{\langle\psi|\hat{O}\psi\rangle}{\langle\psi|\psi\rangle}$. But the result is exactly the same if we compute

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{\rho}\hat{O}), \tag{5}$$

where $\hat{\rho}$ is Eq. (3).

One can construct one of such probability distributions to arrive to the quantum canonical ensemble $\hat{\rho}_C$:

$$F(|\psi\rangle) = Z^{-1} \sum_k e^{-\beta E_k} \delta\left(|\psi\rangle - |E_k\rangle\right) = -\sum_j \beta^{-1} \frac{\partial \log Z}{\partial E_j} \delta\left(|\psi\rangle - |E_k\rangle\right), \tag{6}$$

with partition function

$$Z = \int_{\mathcal{H}} d\mu(|\psi\rangle) \sum_k e^{-\beta E_k} \delta\left(|\psi\rangle - |E_k\rangle\right) = \sum_k e^{-\beta E_k}, \tag{7}$$

where $\{|E_k\rangle\}_{k=1,\cdots,n}$ represent the energy eigenvectors of Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ and $\{E_k\}$ the corresponding eigenvalues. Of course, as we mentioned above, this representation is not unique.

If we prefer to consider the distribution as defined on the projective space $\mathcal{PH}$, we have

$$F(P_\psi) = Z^{-1} \sum_k e^{-\beta E_k} \delta\left(P_\psi - \frac{|E_k\rangle\langle E_k|}{\langle E_k|E_k\rangle}\right), \tag{8}$$

where now the partition function is written as:

$$Z = \int_{\mathcal{PH}} d\mu(P_\psi) \sum_k e^{-\beta E_k} \delta\left(P_\psi - \frac{|E_k\rangle\langle E_k|}{\langle E_k|E_k\rangle}\right) = \sum_k e^{-\beta E_k}, \tag{9}$$

where $d\mu$ represents an invariant measure on $\mathcal{PH}$.

Notice that these are just the expressions for the spectral decomposition of density matrix (1) written as a probability distribution on $\mathcal{H}$ or $\mathcal{PH}$. These distributions select, out of all states of $\mathcal{H}$ (equivalently of $\mathcal{PH}$), only those which are eigenstates of the Hamiltonian, and assigns to them the corresponding Boltzmann probability. This may lead one to think that the canonical ensemble contains some kind of preference for those states, but this is not true. Invoking the above-mentioned non-uniqueness, one may use a different distribution F to construct the canonical ensemble $\hat{\rho}_C$, without using delta functions centered at the Hamiltonian eigenstates. It could be a continuous distribution over the entire space, or even one distribution that assigns zero probability to those eigenstates.

Brody and coauthors (see Refs. [7, 8]) and Jona-Lasinio and Presilla (see Refs. [10, 11]) introduced another distribution, following a seminal idea by Schrödinger [1]. The main point is to consider, instead of only one state for each eigenvalue of the Hamiltonian, all physical states of $\mathcal{H}$ (or $\mathcal{PH}$) leading to the same expectation

value for $\hat{H}$, and assign to all of them the Boltzmann probability with respect to that expectation value, i.e., $(1/Z)\exp(-\beta\langle\psi|\hat{H}|\psi\rangle)$. As we said, we will call this distribution the Schrödinger-Gibbs distribution and represent it as F^{SG}. Notice that, by construction, F^{SG} can be thought as a direct generalization to the quantum realm of the classical canonical distribution. But, as we are going to see, its properties are different to the classical case because of the quantum nature of the states it is defined on.

The SG distribution can thus be written as:

$$F^{SG}(|\psi\rangle) = (Z^{SG})^{-1}\delta(1-\langle\psi|\psi\rangle)e^{-\beta\langle\psi|\hat{H}\psi\rangle}, \tag{10}$$

where now the partition function reads

$$Z^{SG} = \int_{\mathcal{H}} d\mu(|\psi\rangle)\delta(1-\langle\psi|\psi\rangle)e^{-\beta\langle\psi|\hat{H}\psi\rangle} = \int_{S} d\mu(|\psi\rangle)e^{-\beta\langle\psi|\hat{H}\psi\rangle}, \tag{11}$$

and we denote as S the sphere of vectors in $\mathcal{H}$ of norm equal to one.‡ This last distribution is equivalent to a distribution F^{SG} defined on the projective space $\mathcal{PH}$ (if interested see Appendix B), which, defining the expectation value of operator $\hat{H}$ on projector $P_\psi = \frac{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|}{\langle\psi|\psi\rangle} \in \mathcal{PH}$ as

$$H(P_\psi) := \mathrm{Tr}(P_\psi\hat{H}), \tag{12}$$

can be written as:

$$F^{SG}(P_\psi) = Z_{SG}^{-1}e^{-\beta H(P_\psi)}, \tag{13}$$

with partition function

$$Z^{SG} = \int_{\mathcal{PH}} d\mu(P_\psi)e^{-\beta H(P_\psi)}. \tag{14}$$

If we evaluate the density matrix associated to distribution (13) (and use the result proved in Appendix B to evaluate the integrals on the sphere S of states of $\mathcal{H}$ with norm equal to one) we obtain:

$$\hat{\rho}^{SG} = (Z^{SG})^{-1}\int_{S} d\mu(|\psi\rangle)e^{-\beta\langle\psi|\hat{H}\psi\rangle}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|, \tag{15}$$

where the partition function is:

$$Z^{SG} = \int_{S} d\mu(|\psi\rangle)e^{-\beta\langle\psi|\hat{H}\psi\rangle}, \tag{16}$$

and $d\mu(|\psi\rangle)$ represents now the volume element induced on S by the ambient space $\mathcal{H}$.

Now, which is the physical origin of the differences between Eq. (1) and Eq. (15)? If one approaches the canonical ensemble from the microcanonical one the origin is clear. Indeed, while the microcanonical in Refs. [7, 8, 9] is based on the postulate that every state possessing the same energy expectation value

‡ There is an ambiguity in the definition of the volume element on the sphere by using the constraint, but it represents just a global multiplicative constant, which is irrelevant to define the corresponding statistical system.

must be democratically realized (which implements Schrödinger's suggestion), in the traditional microcanonical ensemble, orthogonal states must be the only ones to be included in the sample space of the statistical thermodynamics. The arguments for using only orthogonal states are based on the standard theory of probability (see for instance Secs 4.5 and 4.6 of Ref. [23] and Ref [24]), and on the relationship between information theory and thermodynamics [25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33].

2.2. Quantum properties of the Schrödinger-Gibbs distribution

Let us now study the properties of density matrix (15) in more detail. First of all, for technical reasons that will become clear later, we want to prove that the SG density matrix commutes with the Hamiltonian and hence both operators can be diagonalized in a common eigenbasis. The simplest way to do this is to consider a unitary evolution for $\hat{\rho}^{SG}$ of the form

$$\hat{\rho}^{SG}(t) = \hat{U}(t)\hat{\rho}^{SG}(0)\hat{U}^{\dagger}(t), \tag{17}$$

with

$$\hat{U}(t) := e^{i\hat{H}t}. \tag{18}$$

Since the the canonical ensemble is typically used for systems in contact with an external environment, this evolution is not claimed to be the physical one for $\hat{\rho}^{SG}$. It is just an intermediate step in a mathematical proof.

Under the same evolution, the volume element $d\mu$ on S and the expectation value of the energy $\langle\psi|\hat{H}\psi\rangle$ are, because of unitarity, constant in "time". Thus, for any t, we can write

$$\langle\psi(t)|\hat{H}\psi(t)\rangle = \langle\psi(0)|\hat{H}\psi(0)\rangle \qquad \forall t$$

and

$$d\mu(|\psi(0)\rangle) = d\mu(|\psi(t)\rangle) \qquad \forall t,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\rho}^{SG}(t_*) = \hat{U}(t_*)\hat{\rho}^{SG}(0)\hat{U}(t_*)^{\dagger} &= \int_S d\mu(|\psi(0)\rangle) e^{-\beta\langle\psi(0)|\hat{H}\psi(0)\rangle}\hat{U}(t_*)|\psi(0)\rangle\langle\psi(0)|\hat{U}(t_*)^{\dagger} \\ &= \int_S d\mu(|\psi(t_*)\rangle) e^{-\beta\langle\psi(t_*)|\hat{H}\psi(t_*)\rangle}|\psi(t_*)\rangle\langle\psi(t_*)| = \hat{\rho}^{SG}(0).\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Therefore, we know that the density matrix is independent from t and hence commutes with the Hamiltonian:

$$[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}^{SG}] = 0. \tag{20}$$

On a different matter, and in order to compute the integral in eq. (16), we can use the tools of complex analysis, as it is presented in Appendix C. The result for the partition function is obtained in Eqs. (C.9-C.11). Assuming that there exist p different eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ with degeneracies $d_1, \cdots, d_p$, the partition function is written as:

$$Z^{SG} = \sum_{k=1}^{p} e^{-\beta E_k} F_k, \tag{21}$$

where

$$F_k = -\frac{(2\pi)^n}{(d_k-1)!} \sum_{\substack{j_0,\cdots,j_p=1 \\ j_0+j_1+\cdots j_p=d_k-1}}^{d_k-1} \binom{d_k-1}{j_0,\cdots,j_s} \prod_{\substack{s=1 \\ s\neq k}}^{p} \frac{(-1)^{j_0} d_s(d_s+1)\cdots(d_s+j_s-1)}{(\beta E_j - \beta E_k)^{d_s+j_s}}, \tag{22}$$

and $\binom{d_k-1}{j_0,\cdots,j_s}$ represents the multinomial coefficient

$$\binom{d_k-1}{j_0,\cdots,j_s} = \frac{(d_k-1)!}{j_0!\cdots j_s!}.$$

Notice that the traditional distribution (6) associated to the QCE corresponds to the case where

$$F_k = d_k; \qquad \forall k = 1,\cdots,p, \tag{23}$$

where d_k stands for the degeneracy of the energy level E_k.

From the above expressions, we can obtain the spectral decomposition of the density matrix $\hat{\rho}^{SG}$ defined by Eq. (15). Indeed, we know that $\hat{\rho}^{SG}$ is diagonal in the energy-eigenbasis, and thus it can be written as

$$\hat{\rho}^{SG} = \sum_k \omega_k \frac{|E_k\rangle\langle E_k|}{\langle E_k|E_k\rangle} \tag{24}$$

where the eigenvalue ω_k corresponding to the eigenvector $|E_k\rangle$ is equal to:

$$\omega_k = \hat{\rho}^{SG}_{kk} = \int_S d\mu(|\psi\rangle) e^{-\beta \sum_j E_j |\psi_j|^2} |\psi_k|^2, \tag{25}$$

and $|\psi\rangle = \sum_j \psi_j |E_j\rangle$. Each ω_k is thus obtained as a suitable derivative of the partition function Z^{SG}, as it happend in the case of the canonical distribution:

$$\omega_k = -\beta^{-1}\frac{\partial \log Z^{SG}}{\partial E_k} = \frac{e^{-\beta E_k}F_k}{Z^{SG}} - \beta^{-1}\frac{\sum_{j=1}^p e^{-\beta E_j}\frac{\partial F_j}{\partial E_k}}{Z^{SG}}. \tag{26}$$

Therefore, we proved that probability distribution (10) can be written as

$$F^{SG}(|\psi\rangle) = \sum_k \left(\frac{e^{-\beta E_k}F_k}{Z^{SG}} - \beta^{-1}\frac{\sum_{j=1}^p e^{-\beta E_j}\frac{\partial F_j}{\partial E_k}}{Z^{SG}} \right) \delta(|\psi\rangle - |E_k\rangle); \tag{27}$$

which is formally analogous to distribution (6), but with very different content because of the second term in the sum. If we write it as a density matrix we have:

$$\hat{\rho}^{SG} = \sum_k \left(\frac{e^{-\beta E_k}F_k}{Z^{SG}} - \beta^{-1}\frac{\sum_{j=1}^p e^{-\beta E_j}\frac{\partial F_j}{\partial E_k}}{Z^{SG}} \right) \frac{|E_k\rangle\langle E_k|}{\langle E_k|E_k\rangle}. \tag{28}$$

Only if the functions F_k were independent from the energy eigenvalues and equal to the degeneracies d_k, $\hat{\rho}^{SG}$ would coincide with the usual canonical distribution $\hat{\rho}_C$ in Eq. (1). Thus, given any β, the average value of any quantum observable O will be in general different in one ensemble and in the other.

2.3. Thermodynamical properties of the Schrödinger-Gibbs distribution

We have just seen how, even if F^{SG} is analogous to the canonical distribution of a classical (continuous) system, the quantum nature of the system it describes makes it equivalent to a quantum ensemble described by a density matrix $\hat{\rho}^{SG}$ which is different from the traditional canonical one. We want to check now if, despite these differences, we can still define an appropriate thermodynamics associated to the SG distribution.

In order to define a system in thermodynamical equilibrium, we must obtain the corresponding thermodynamic magnitudes, both extensive and intensive ones, from the statistical-mechanics objects. Extensive magnitudes are defined from the partition function of the system as its logarithm and the corresponding derivatives. Thus, for a system described by a partition function Z, the Helmholtz free energy F (which is the natural free energy in the canonical ensemble) corresponds to

$$F = -\beta^{-1} \log Z; \tag{29}$$

the thermodynamic (also called sometimes "internal") energy U corresponds to the average value of the energy, which can be obtained through

$$U = \beta^{-1} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \beta}; \tag{30}$$

and the thermodynamic entropy S^{th} is written as

$$S^{th} = k_B \left(\log Z - \beta \frac{\partial \log Z}{\partial \beta} \right). \tag{31}$$

If the partition function Z is factorizable, functions F, U and S^{th} are extensive magnitudes. Then, the extensiveness of functions F, U or S^{th} in the present case, is equivalent to the factorizability property of the partition function Z^{SG}. That is, if we consider a system defined as the composition of non-interacting subsystems, the partition function of the complete system must be written as the product of the partition function restricted to the subsystems in order to yield extensive thermodynamic functions. Notice that, so far, β represents just a parameter which is used to define the partition function and may not have any physical meaning at the end of the day (for example, if the resulting thermodynamics is found to be inappropriate).

Consider then that the total Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is equal to the tensor product of the Hilbert spaces describing the corresponding subsystems, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_m, \tag{32}$$

with dimensions $n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_m$ (for simplicity we assume the case of finite-dimensional quantum systems). The dimension of $\mathcal{H}$ is thus given by $n = n_1 \cdots n_m$. Since we assume that there is no interaction among the subsystems, the total Hamiltonian is written as the sum

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} \hat{H}_\alpha = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} \hat{\mathbb{I}}_{n_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{\mathbb{I}}_{n_{\alpha-1}} \otimes \hat{h}_\alpha \otimes \hat{\mathbb{I}}_{n_{\alpha+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{\mathbb{I}}_{n_m}. \tag{33}$$

As all $\hat{H}_\alpha$ commute, the tensor product of the eigenbases of the $\hat{h}_\alpha$ is an eigenbasis of the total Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$. We thus have that each element of the total-energy

eigenbasis $\{|E_k\rangle\}$ can be written as the tensor product of the corresponding elements of the different eigenbases $\{|e^\alpha_{j_\alpha}\rangle\}$ of the subsystems:

$$|E_k\rangle = |e^1_{j_1}\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |e^m_{j_m}\rangle; \qquad E_k = e^1_{j_1} + \cdots + e^m_{j_m}. \tag{34}$$

With no loss of generality, we will assume that

$$E_k \leq E_{k+1}; \qquad e^\alpha_{j_\alpha} \leq e^\alpha_{j_\alpha+1}, \qquad \forall\alpha. \tag{35}$$

It is well known that the partition function of the canonical distribution $\hat{\rho}_C$ in Eq. (1) factorizes as a product of the partition function of the subsystems (see [22], Sec. 16.2). If we compute the partition function Z^{SG} in this basis, we obtain as a result Eq. (21). If we did the same computation restricted to the subsystem α, we would obtain similar expressions for the partition functions Z^{SG}_α, with the eigenvalues E_k replaced by the eigenvalues $e^\alpha_{j_\alpha}$. In order to check whether or not Z^{SG} factorizes, let us consider the limit $\beta \to \infty$, where we can write that

$$Z^{SG}|_{\beta\to\infty} \sim e^{-\beta E_0} F_{E_0}. \tag{36}$$

Analogously,

$$(Z^{SG})^\alpha|_{\beta\to\infty} \sim e^{-\beta e^\alpha_0} F_{e^\alpha_0}. \tag{37}$$

But it is immediate to check that§

$$F_{E_0} \neq \prod_{\alpha=1}^{m} F_{e^\alpha_0}. \tag{38}$$

Indeed, in the non-degenerate case

$$F_{E_0} = \prod_k \frac{1}{E_k - E_0}; \qquad F_{e^\alpha_0} = \prod_{k_\alpha} \frac{1}{e^\alpha_{k_\alpha} - e^\alpha_0}, \tag{39}$$

and thus

$$\prod_k \frac{1}{E_k - E_0} \neq \prod_\alpha \prod_{k_\alpha} \frac{1}{e^\alpha_{k_\alpha} - e^\alpha_0}. \tag{40}$$

The last inequality can be proved by thinking that, on the right hand side, there are only energy differences corresponding to a change in one subsystem, while, on the left hand side, all possible energy differences are considered.

This being so in the limit $\beta \to \infty$ is sufficient to prove that the partition function Z^{SG} is not in general the product of the partition functions of the subsystems, and therefore that we cannot define extensive magnitudes from Z^{SG}. Besides, this property does not depend on the number of subsystems, and therefore it is still valid in a thermodynamic limit where $m \to \infty$; i.e., we can claim that

$$Z^{SG} \neq \prod_{\alpha=1}^{\infty} Z^{SG}_\alpha. \tag{41}$$

We thus conclude that the thermodynamic functions defined by Eqs. (29), (30) or (31) cannot represent extensive magnitudes.

In principle we may study the same problem from the point of view of the density matrix $\hat{\rho}^{SG}$, but doing so in full generality becomes quite difficult from the computational point of view. We will tackle this analysis in Sec. 3 for the case of a specific quantum system resulting from the composition of two-level systems, and we will recover the same results obtained here but in a much simpler way.

§ For simplicity we will consider the case of non-degenerate ground states.

2.4. The origin of non-extensiveness: integrating over entangled states

Let us consider the simplest case of a composite system by assuming that we have $m = 2$ in Eqs. (32) and (33). We know from Eq. (41) that

$$Z_1^{SG} Z_2^{SG} \neq Z_{12}^{SG}. \tag{42}$$

Now, we want to understand the origin of this difference from a physical point of view.

Now the partition functions for the individual subsystems and for the composite system will read, respectively:

$$Z_1^{SG} = \int_{\mathcal{S}^{n_1}} d\mu(|\psi^1\rangle) e^{-\beta\langle\psi^1|\hat{H}_1\psi^1\rangle}, \tag{43}$$

$$Z_2^{SG} = \int_{\mathcal{S}^{n_2}} d\mu(|\psi^2\rangle) e^{-\beta\langle\psi^2|\hat{H}_2\psi^2\rangle}, \tag{44}$$

and

$$Z_{12}^{SG} = \int_{\mathcal{S}^{n_1 n_2}} d\mu(|\psi\rangle) e^{-\beta\langle\psi|\hat{H}\psi\rangle}, \tag{45}$$

where $\mathcal{S}^{n_1}, \mathcal{S}^{n_2}$ and $\mathcal{S}^{n_1 n_2}$ represent the $(n_1 - 1)$-dimensional, $(n_2 - 1)$–dimensional and $(n_1 n_2 - 1)$-dimensional spheres.

We can write the product of two integrals of the type in Eq. (43) as

$$(Z_1^{SG})(Z_2^{SG}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}^{n_1}\times\mathcal{S}^{n_2}} d\mu_1(|\psi^1\rangle) d\mu_2(|\psi^2\rangle) e^{-\beta\langle\psi^1|\hat{H}_1\psi^1\rangle} e^{-\beta\langle\psi^2|\hat{H}_2\psi^2\rangle}. \tag{46}$$

In a basis like the one in (34), constituted by separable vectors, we have

$$e^{-\beta\langle\psi^1|\hat{H}_1\psi^1\rangle} e^{-\beta\langle\psi^2|\hat{H}_2\psi^2\rangle} = e^{-\beta\sum_{k=1}^{n_1} e_k^1|\psi_k^1|^2} e^{-\beta\sum_{j=1}^{n_2} e_j^2|\psi_j^2|^2} = e^{-\beta\sum_{kj}(e_k^1|\psi_k^1|^2 + e_j^2|\psi_j^2|^2)}. \tag{47}$$

The separability of the vectors also allows to write

$$\sum_{kj}(e_k^1|\psi_k^1|^2 + e_j^2|\psi_j^2|^2) = \langle\psi|\hat{H}\psi\rangle, \qquad \psi = \psi^1 \otimes \psi^2. \tag{48}$$

That is, the resulting exponent is the expectation value of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_1 \otimes \hat{H}_2$, evaluated at the separable points of $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$.

Putting everything together, we have just proved that:

$$(Z_1^{SG})(Z_2^{SG}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}^{n_1}\times\mathcal{S}^{n_2}} d\mu_1(|\psi^1\rangle) d\mu_2(|\psi^2\rangle) e^{-\beta\langle\psi|\hat{H}\psi\rangle}. \tag{49}$$

Eq. (49) sums the same function that (45), but only over the separable states of $\mathcal{S}^{n_1 n_2} \subset \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$; while (45) integrates over all states, both separable and entangled. This explains Eq. (42) from the physical point of view.

If we compare this situation with the traditional canonical distribution described by Eq. (6), we see that the delta functions would restrict the corresponding integrals to the eigenvectors of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$, which, in the case of non-interacting subsystems, correspond always to separable states. Besides, the statistical weight assigned to each of these eigenstates depends only on the eigenspace. On the contrary, if we think about the SG distribution in terms of the corresponding density matrix

(i.e., using expression (28)), we would be considering, apparently, only separable states (the Hamiltonian eigenstates participating of the spectral decomposition), but now the statistical weights associated to them would depend on all the other states. Therefore entangled states are still contributing to the density matrix (28) . We will illustrate this in a simple example in next section.

3. A simple example

In this section we will present numerical examples of the properties discussed in the previous section. We will analyze the two different distributions ((6) and (11)) for a system of N noninteracting two-level particles whose dynamics is described by a Hamiltonian of the form

$$\hat{H} = \sum_k \hat{H}_k = \sum_k \overbrace{\hat{\mathbb{I}}_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{\mathbb{I}}_2}^{k-1} \otimes \hat{h}_k \otimes \overbrace{\hat{\mathbb{I}}_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{\mathbb{I}}_2}^{N-k}, \tag{50}$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{I}}_2$ stands for the identity operator in two dimensions and the one-particle Hamiltonian $\hat{h}_k$ can be written in the corresponding eigenbasis as

$$h_k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \forall k = 1, \cdots, N; \tag{51}$$

where Δ represents the energy-gap.

Let us now consider a basis for $\mathcal{H}$ defined as the tensor product of the energy eigenbases of every two-level subsystem. Thus, if we write $n = 2^N$ for short, we have the set of vectors of the form

$$|i_1, \cdots, i_n\rangle = |i_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_n\rangle; \qquad \text{where} \quad |i_k\rangle = \begin{cases} |0\rangle \\ |1\rangle \end{cases}. \tag{52}$$

We also fix an ordering for the basis:

$$\mathcal{B} = \{|0,0,\cdots,0,0\rangle,\ |0,0,\cdots,0,1\rangle,\ |0,0,\cdots,1,0\rangle,\cdots,\ |0,1,\cdots,1,1\rangle,\ |1,1,\cdots,1\rangle\}. \tag{53}$$

In this basis, it is a simple task to verify that the eigenvalues $\{E_k\}$ of the total Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ and the corresponding degeneracies d_k are given by

$$E_k = k\Delta; \qquad d_k = \binom{N}{k}, \qquad k = 0, \cdots, N. \tag{54}$$

3.1. The partition function and factorizability

Our goal now is to obtain the expressions for the Schrödinger-Gibbs distribution corresponding to this Hamiltonian. We saw that the ensemble is defined by the partition function in (11). Thus, our goal is to write

$$Z^{SG} = \int_{\mathcal{S}^{2^{N+1}-1}} d\mu(\psi) e^{-\beta\langle\psi|\hat{H}\psi\rangle}, \tag{55}$$

for the particular case of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (50). Previously, from the analysis in Appendix C, the expression for Z^{SG} was written as in Eq. (21), where now $n = 2^N$ and the spectrum is given by Eq. (54).

The simplest cases can be easily written. Indeed, we can consider the case $N = 1$ (i.e., $n = 2$) and write Eq. (21) as

$$Z^{SG}_{N=1} = \frac{(2\pi)^2\left(1 - e^{-\beta\Delta}\right)}{\beta\Delta}. \tag{56}$$

Analogously, the next case is $N = 2$ (or, equivalently, $n = 4$):

$$Z^{SG}_{N=2} = \frac{(2\pi)^4(1 - 2\beta\Delta e^{-\beta\Delta} - e^{-2\beta\Delta})}{2\beta^3\Delta^3}. \tag{57}$$

It is immediate to check that, as we proved in general, the partition function does not factorize, i.e.,

$$Z^{SG}_{N=2} \neq (Z^{SG}_{N=1})^2. \tag{58}$$

3.2. Thermodynamic entropies and specific heat

We can also compute the corresponding functions S^{th} using Eq. (31). We obtain:

$$S^{th}_{N=1} = \frac{k_B\left(-\beta\Delta + e^{\beta\Delta} + \left(e^{\beta\Delta} - 1\right)\log\left(\frac{(2\pi)^2\left(1-e^{-\beta\Delta}\right)}{\beta\Delta}\right) - 1\right)}{e^{\beta\Delta} - 1}, \tag{59}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S^{th}_{N=2} =& \frac{\left(-2\beta\Delta e^{\beta\Delta} + e^{2\beta\Delta} - 1\right)\log\left(\frac{8\pi^4 e^{-2\beta\Delta}\left(-2\beta\Delta e^{\beta\Delta}+e^{2\beta\Delta}-1\right)}{\beta^3\Delta^3}\right)}{-2\beta\Delta e^{\beta\Delta} + e^{2\beta\Delta} - 1} \\ &+ \frac{-2\beta\Delta - 2\beta\Delta e^{\beta\Delta}(\beta\Delta + 2) + 3e^{2\beta\Delta} - 3}{-2\beta\Delta e^{\beta\Delta} + e^{2\beta\Delta} - 1}. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Again, it is simple to verify that these functions are not additive, i.e., that

$$S^{th}_{N=2} \neq 2S^{th}_{N=1}. \tag{61}$$

Indeed, if we plot both functions we see that the behavior is similar but that they do not coincide (see Fig. 1). Therefore, we must conclude that S^{th} cannot model an extensive magnitude, and hence it cannot represent the thermodynamic entropy of a physical system. Besides this non-extensiveness, S^{th} does not satisfy other properties that are required for the thermodynamic entropy, such as positiveness and that it must tend to zero in the limit where $T = \frac{1}{k_B\beta}$ tends to zero. Of course, in this case, T must be considered just a parameter and in no way can it be identified with a physical temperature. To be able to secure such an interpretation, it should be part of a consistent thermodynamics, which, as we have just proved, is not the case.

If we also compute the cases $N = 3$ and $N = 4$ (they can be found in the Mathematica notebook included as Supplementary Material, as the results are too long to detail them here), we can represent the corresponding entropies together with the previous ones and confirm that, again, their zero-T limit is different from zero and the functions are negative in a measurable part of their domains (see Fig. 2).

We can also consider other magnitudes such as the specific heat C_v, which we plot in Fig. 3. For C_v, we recover the dependence obtained by Brody and coworkers in the simplest $N = 1$ case [7], but we can also see (thanks to the more general calculations in this work) how C_v scales with the number of subsystems N. Finally, notice that the limit $\lim_{T\to 0} C_v$ increases with N, while for a consistent thermodynamic description it must go to zero.



Figure 1. Plot of the functions $S^{th}_{N=2}$ (green line) and $2S^{th}_{N=1}$ (red line) versus T for $k_B = 1 = \Delta$.



Figure 2. Plot of the functions $S^{th}_{N=1}$ (red line), $S^{th}_{N=2}$ (green line), $S^{th}_{N=3}$ (blue line) and $S^{th}_{N=4}$ (pink line) versus T for $\Delta = 1 = k_B$.

3.3. Description in terms of density matrices

3.3.1. Density matrices and von Neumann entropy Apart from the description in terms of probability distributions, we can also describe the systems in the previous sections by their corresponding density matrices, using Eq. (28). For the simple cases $N = 1$ and $N = 2$ we obtain:

$$\rho^{SG}_{N=1} = \left(-\frac{\beta\Delta e^{\beta\Delta} - e^{\beta\Delta} + 1}{\beta\Delta\left(1 - e^{\beta\Delta}\right)}\right)\frac{|E_0\rangle\langle E_0|}{\langle E_0|E_0\rangle} - \left(\frac{-\beta\Delta + e^{\beta\Delta} - 1}{\beta\Delta\left(1 - e^{\beta\Delta}\right)}\right)\frac{|E_\Delta\rangle\langle E_\Delta|}{\langle E_\Delta|E_\Delta\rangle}, \quad (62)$$



Figure 3. Plot of the specific heat vs. T for $N = 1, 2, 3$ and $k_B = 1 = \Delta$. We can see that the limit when $T \to 0$ increases with N, while for a consistent thermodynamic description it must go to zero.

and

$$\rho^{SG}_{N=2} = \left(\frac{2\beta\Delta + (\beta\Delta - 3)\sinh(\beta\Delta) + (\beta\Delta - 2)\cosh(\beta\Delta) + 2}{2\beta\Delta(\sinh(\beta\Delta) - \beta\Delta)}\right)\frac{|E_0\rangle\langle E_0|}{\langle E_0|E_0\rangle}$$
$$+ \left(\frac{\beta^2\Delta^2 - 2\cosh(\beta\Delta) + 2}{\beta^2\Delta^2 - \beta\Delta\sinh(\beta\Delta)}\right)\frac{|E^1_\Delta\rangle\langle E^1_\Delta|}{\langle E^1_\Delta|E^1_\Delta\rangle} + \left(\frac{\beta^2\Delta^2 - 2\cosh(\beta\Delta) + 2}{\beta^2\Delta^2 - \beta\Delta\sinh(\beta\Delta)}\right)\frac{|E^2_\Delta\rangle\langle E^2_\Delta|}{\langle E^2_\Delta|E^2_\Delta\rangle}$$
$$+ \left(\frac{2\beta\Delta - (\beta\Delta + 3)\sinh(\beta\Delta) + (\beta\Delta + 2)\cosh(\beta\Delta) - 2}{2\beta\Delta(\beta\Delta - \sinh(\beta\Delta))}\right)\frac{|E_{2\Delta}\rangle\langle E_{2\Delta}|}{\langle E_{2\Delta}|E_{2\Delta}\rangle}, \tag{63}$$

where $|E_0\rangle$ and $|E_\Delta\rangle$ represent the energy eigenstates for $N = 1$, and $|E_0\rangle, |E^1_\Delta\rangle, |E^2_\Delta\rangle$ and $|E_{2\Delta}\rangle$ are the eigenstates associated to the $N = 2$ case. The vectors $|E^1_\Delta\rangle$ and $|E^2_\Delta\rangle$ span the two-dimensional eigenspace with energy equal to E_Δ.

It is now easy to verify that

$$\hat{\rho}^{SG}_{N=2} \neq \hat{\rho}^{SG}_{N=1} \otimes \hat{\rho}^{SG}_{N=1}. \tag{64}$$

It suffices to check that the coefficients of the projectors onto the ground state ($\frac{|E_0\rangle\langle E_0|}{\langle E_0|E_0\rangle}$) do not coincide. This relation translates Eq. (58) into the language of density matrices and therefore it provides an alternative proof of the lack of thermodynamic equilibrium states associated to the statistical ensemble defined by the SG distribution in Eq. (10), for the case of the Hamiltonian in (50). Indeed, since the Hamiltonian does not introduce a coupling among the different subsystems, the tensor product of equilibrium density states representing single subsystems (such as Eq. (62)), should define equilibrium density states of the composite system. This is a property which holds for the usual canonical ensemble in Eq. (1), but fails for the SG distribution, as we have just shown.

The SG distribution can also be studied from the point of view of von Neumann's entropy

$$S^{vN} = -k_B \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{\rho}^{SG} \log \hat{\rho}^{SG}). \tag{65}$$

We know that this quantity is always positive and well defined for any density matrix we evaluate it on. However, we can easily verify that, in the SG case, it does not coincide with S^{th}. This discrepancy is presented graphically in Fig. 4.



Figure 4. Plots of the von Neumann entropy (continuous) and S^{th} (dashed) for $N = 1$ (blue) and $N = 2$ (red), as a function of T. We set $k_B = 1 = \Delta$.

We can also check that, as a consequence of the non-factorizability of the partition function, the von Neumann entropy is not additive. Indeed, as it can be seen in Fig. 5, the values for twice the entropy of the $N = 1$ system and the entropy of the $N = 2$ case do not coincide. We can also plot (see Fig. 6) the von Neumann entropies for



Figure 5. Plot of von Neumann's entropies: $2S^{vN}_{N=1}$ (blue) and $S^{vN}_{N=2}$ (red) vs. T, with $k_B = 1 = \Delta$.

$N = 1$, $N = 2$ and $N = 3$ and verify that they are not equally spaced.



Figure 6. Plot of von Neumann's entropy for $N = 1$ (blue), $N = 2$ (red) and $N = 3$ (green), vs. T, with $k_B = 1 = \Delta$.

3.3.2. Entanglement We can explain this non-additivity of von Neumann's entropy in a simple manner if we appeal to the notion of entanglement. If we compute the partial trace of the density matrix in Eq. (63), we obtain a density matrix $\hat{\rho}_1 = \mathrm{Tr}_2 \hat{\rho}^{SG}_{N=2}$, which we can write as

$$\hat{\rho}_1 = \left(\frac{2\beta\Delta(\beta\Delta - 1) + (3 - \beta\Delta)\sinh(\beta\Delta) - (\beta\Delta + 2)\cosh(\beta\Delta) + 2}{2\beta\Delta(\beta\Delta - \sinh(\beta\Delta))} \right) \frac{|E_0\rangle\langle E_0|}{\langle E_0|E_0\rangle} + \left(\frac{2(\beta\Delta(\beta\Delta + 1) + 1) - (\beta\Delta + 3)\sinh(\beta\Delta) + (\beta\Delta - 2)\cosh(\beta\Delta)}{2\beta\Delta(\beta\Delta - \sinh(\beta\Delta))} \right) \frac{|E_\Delta\rangle\langle E_\Delta|}{\langle E_\Delta|E_\Delta\rangle} \tag{66}$$

Analogously, we can define (and compute)

$$\hat{\rho}_2 = \mathrm{Tr}_1 \hat{\rho}^{SG}_{N=2} = \hat{\rho}_1. \tag{67}$$

But is is immediate to verify that

$$\hat{\rho}^{SG}_{N=2} \neq \hat{\rho}_1 \otimes \hat{\rho}_2. \tag{68}$$

This is just reflecting upon the fact that SG density matrices, $\hat{\rho}^{SG}$, represent entangled states, as we advanced in Sec. 2.4. Indeed, being defined from partition functions Z^{SG} which are not factorizable, the description in terms of density matrices $\hat{\rho}^{SG}$ must also encode this property, and it does so in the standard way. We also know that, while separable states have additive von Neumann entropy (see Appendix A for a simple proof), the von Neumann entropy of entangled states is never additive (the difference between the entropy of the composite system with respect to the sum of the entropies of the subsystems is what is called the *quantum mutual information* in quantum information theory).

4. Conclusions

A priori, there are at least two basic ways of defining the statistical mechanics of quantum systems. At first sight, they seem to differ in what one considers to be the "(micro) states" of the quantum system; i.e., the entities that should be "counted" in the process of computing our partition functions and everything that comes out of them. In the first, traditional way, it seems that you only count over the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian operator (or in general over any orthogonal basis of the Hilbert space) and attach the usual Boltzmann weight to each one of them. This simple description was criticized long ago by Schrödinger [1], and the critique has been used by several authors to propose a seemingly very different starting point. Namely, that you should count over every possible ray of the relevant subspace of your Hilbert space and distribute statistical weights on them using continuous probability densities [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]. As we have seen in this work, the differences between both descriptions are subtler than it appears at first sight, and the reason is the well known fact that the mapping between probability densities on rays and density matrices is not 1-to-1. However, the interest and possible applications of the proposals based on the second point of view are considerable and thus their properties must be carefully analyzed.

In this paper we have tackled one such analysis focusing on one of the most natural among the mentioned proposals (see Refs. [7, 8, 9, 10, 11]) and studying its implications at the thermodynamical level. We have proved that the Schrödinger-Gibbs density distribution that is defined as the exponential of (minus β times) the expected value of the Hamiltonian operator on the corresponding ray, cannot used to construct a consistent quantum thermodynamics. Its problems at the thermodynamical level are many, and we have devoted some time to show that, in particular, the thermodynamic functions defined by it are non-extensive. Despite the possible application of the SG ensemble to non-equilibrium situations (as discussed in some of the references above, see also [34] for a very recent approach to nonequilibrium and irreversibility), this non-extensiveness is a serious blow to its appropriateness to describe the equilibrium of quantum physical systems. On the other hand, the use of density distributions is a natural option when studying hybrid quantum-classical models such as Ehrenfest models in nonadiabatic molecular dynamics (see [4] and [5]). In future works we plan to study the consequences of the analysis in this paper for the equilibrium and non-equilibrium statistics of hybrid quantum-classical systems, where the nonlinear effects on the dynamics produced by the classical subsystem may alter significantly the results we have presented here.

Appendix A. Additivity of von Neumann's estropy

We will include, for completeness, a classical proof of the additivity of von Neumann's entropy (see, for instance, [35]).

Let $\mathcal{S}_{12} = \mathcal{S}_1 + \mathcal{S}_2$ be a composite system with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{12} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, of dimension d_{12}. We want to prove that the von Neumann entropy is additive on product states $\hat{\rho}_{12} = \hat{\rho}_1 \otimes \hat{\rho}_2$, i.e.,

$$S(\hat{\rho}_{12}) = S(\hat{\rho}_1) + S(\hat{\rho}_2), \tag{A.1}$$

where $\mathrm{Tr}\hat{\rho}_{12} = 1$.

Additivity comes from the fact that the spectrum of $\rho_{12} = \rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$ consists of the products of the eigenvalues of ρ_1 and ρ_2:

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\rho}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{d_1} \mu_i |\mu_i\rangle\langle\mu_i| \\ \hat{\rho}_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{d_2} \nu_j |\nu_j\rangle\langle\nu_j| \end{cases} \Rightarrow \quad \hat{\rho}_{12} = \sum_k r_k |r_k\rangle\langle r_k| = \sum_{i=1}^{d_1}\sum_{j=1}^{d_2} \mu_i\nu_j |\mu_i\nu_j\rangle\langle\mu_i\nu_j|, \quad \text{(A.2)}$$

where we denote as $\{|\mu_i\rangle\}_{i=1,\cdots,d_1}$ and $\{|\nu_j\rangle\}_{j=1,\cdots,d_2}$ the eigenvectors of $\hat{\rho}_1$ and $\hat{\rho}_2$ respectively, and as $\{\mu_i\}_{i=1,\cdots,d_1}$ and $\{\nu_j\}_{j=1,\cdots,d_2}$ the corresponding eigenvalues.

If we compute von Neumann's entropy in the eigenbasis of $\hat{\rho}_{12}$ we obtain

$$S(\hat{\rho}_{12}) = -k_B \sum_k r_k \log r_k = -k_B \sum_{i=1}^{d_1}\sum_{j=1}^{d_2} \mu_i\nu_j \log(\mu_i\nu_j) \quad \text{(A.3)}$$

$$= -k_B \sum_{i=1}^{d_1}\sum_{j=1}^{d_2} \mu_i\nu_j (\log\mu_i + \log\nu_j)$$

$$= -k_B \sum_{j=1}^{d_2} \nu_j \sum_{i=1}^{d_1} \mu_i \log\mu_i - k_B \sum_{i=1}^{d_1} \mu_i \sum_{j=1}^{d_2} \nu_j \log\nu_j \quad \text{(A.4)}$$

$$= -k_B \sum_{i=1}^{d_1} \mu_i \log\mu_i - k_B \sum_{j=1}^{d_2} \nu_j \log\nu_j$$

$$= S(\hat{\rho}_1) + S(\hat{\rho}_2) \quad \text{(A.5)}$$

where the fact that $\mathrm{Tr}\hat{\rho}_1 = \mathrm{Tr}\hat{\rho}_2 = 1$ has been used. As the trace does not depend on the basis, the result is proved.

Appendix B. Integrals on the Projective space

For the sake of completeness, we prove in this appendix the following result: Consider a function f defined on the sphere $S^{2n-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, which is constant along the fibers of the fibration:

$$\tau : S^{2n-1} \to \mathbb{CP}^{n-1}; \quad \text{(B.1)}$$

i.e., which can be obtained as the pullback $\tau^*(f)$ of a function f on the projective space, or, from the physical point of view, which represents a true physical quantity, as it does not depend on the global phase of the state. Notice that Eq. (B.1) corresponds to the restriction of the canonical fibration $\mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{CP}^{n-1}$ to the states of norm equal to one.

Then, we have that

$$\int_{S^{2n-1}} d\mu_S \tau^*(f) = 2\pi \int_{\mathbb{CP}^{n-1}} d\mu_C f, \quad \text{(B.2)}$$

where $d\mu_S$ and $d\mu_C$ represent the corresponding volume forms.

Let us recall that both the sphere and the projective space are nontrivial differentiable manifolds and therefore that integrals on them are obtained by patching

together the integrals on the charts of their atlases. Thus, given an open covering $\{U_k\}$ for the manifold M, we consider a subordinated partition of unity $\{\epsilon_k\}$, i.e., a collection of functions $\epsilon_k : U_k \to \mathbb{R}$ which satisfy that for any point $p \in M$, the sum of the functions corresponding to the open sets to which the point belong, is equal to one:

$$\forall p \in U_{j_1} \cap \cdots \cap U_{j_m} \Rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{m} \epsilon_{j_k}(p) = 1. \tag{B.3}$$

With these, we define the integral on the manifold M as

$$\int_M d\mu(p) F(p) = \sum_k \int_{U_k} d\mu_{U_k}(p) \epsilon_k(p) F_{U_k}(p), \tag{B.4}$$

where F represents a function on M, $d\mu$ the corresponding volume element, and $d\mu_{U_k}$ and F_{U_k} represent the restrictions of the volume element and the function, respectively, to the open set U_k.

We can now use the bundle structure $\tau : S^{2n-1} \to \mathbb{CP}^{n-1}$ to define a covering for S^{2n-1} as a product:

$$V_{lm}^{S^{2n-1}} = U_l^{S^1} \times U_m^{\mathbb{CP}^{n-1}}, \tag{B.5}$$

where $\{U_l^{S^1}\}$ represent open sets of a covering for S^1 and $\{U_m^{\mathbb{CP}^{n-1}}\}$ represent open sets of a covering of the projective space. Such a covering always exists because of the bundle structure.

Then, consider a partition of unity $\{\epsilon_k\}$ for $\mathbb{CP}^{n-1}$ associated to the covering defined by the open sets $\{U_k^{\mathbb{CP}^{n-1}}\}$. We can extend this family to define a covering for S^{2n-1} by considering a partition of the unity $\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$ associated to the covering $\{W_1, W_2\}$ for the group $U(1) \sim S^1$, and defining

$$\omega_{jk}(p) = \varepsilon_j(p) \epsilon_k(p). \tag{B.6}$$

It is trivial to verify that $\{\omega_{jk}\}$ defines a partition of the unity related to the covering $\{V_{jk}^{S^{2n-1}}\}$.

Next, can define the integral on the sphere as:

$$\int_{S^{2n-1}} d\mu_S \tau^*(f) = \sum_{jk} \int_{V_{jk}^{S^{2n-1}}} d\mu_{V_{jk}} \omega_{jk} \tau^*(f), \tag{B.7}$$

and, as the integrand is constant on the fibers, we can split the integral in the following way:

$$\int_{S^{2n-1}} d\mu_S \tau^*(f) = \left(\sum_j \int_j d\mu_{W_j} \varepsilon_j \right) \sum_k \int_{U^{\mathbb{CP}_k^{n-1}}} d\mu_{U_k} \epsilon_k \tau^*(f). \tag{B.8}$$

By definition the integral on $U(1)$ is equal to 2π and thus we proved that Eq. (B.2) holds.

Appendix C. The partition function

Our goal in this appendix is to compute the partition function

$$Z^{SG} = \int_S d\mu(|\psi\rangle) e^{-\beta \langle \psi | \hat{H} \psi \rangle}. \tag{C.1}$$

Consider this distribution written as in Eq. (11) and implement the constraint by a complex integral in the form

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{SG} &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\lambda \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} d\mu(\psi) e^{-\beta\sum_k E_k|\psi_k|^2} e^{i\lambda(\langle\psi|\psi\rangle-1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\lambda e^{-i\lambda} \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} d\mu(\psi) \prod_{k=1}^{n} e^{-(\beta E_k - i\lambda)|\psi_k|^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{C.2}$$

where $d\mu(\psi) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} d\psi_k d\bar{\psi}_k$ is the canonical volume element in $\mathbb{C}^n$.

Now, the Gaussian integrals factorize and can be computed straightforwardly:

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{SG} &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\lambda e^{-i\lambda} \prod_{k=1}^{n} \int_{\mathbb{C}} d\mu(\psi_k) e^{-(\beta E_k - i\lambda)|\psi_k|^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\lambda e^{-i\lambda} \prod_{k=1}^{n} \frac{2\pi}{(\beta E_k - i\lambda)}. \end{aligned} \tag{C.3}$$

If we also take into account the degeneracies of the eigenvalues we have:

$$Z^{SG} = (2\pi)^{n-1}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\lambda e^{-i\lambda} \prod_{k=1}^{p} \frac{1}{(\beta E_k - i\lambda)^{d_k}}, \tag{C.4}$$

where d_k represents the degeneracy of eigenvalue E_k and the product runs only over different eigenvalues (we assume that there are p of them).

The last integral (over λ) must be evaluated on the complex plane, where the integration runs over the real axis. To this end, let us first make a change of coordinates

$$\xi = i\lambda, \tag{C.5}$$

that produces:

$$Z^{SG} = i(2\pi)^{n-1}\int_{\gamma} d\xi e^{-\xi} \prod_{k=1}^{p} \frac{1}{(\beta E_k - \xi)^{d_k}}, \tag{C.6}$$

where now γ is the imaginary axis.

Next, we define a closed integration region Γ on the left half plane containing the imaginary axis and a semicircle of infinite radius as it is depicted in Fig. C1. From Cauchy theorem, we know that the integral is equal to the sum of the corresponding residues at the poles of the integrand, which in this case lie on

$$\xi_k = \beta E_k; \tag{C.7}$$

their order corresponding to the degeneracy of the corresponding eigenvalue. We have thus that:

$$Z^{SG} = i(2\pi)^{n-1} 2\pi i \sum_{j=1}^{p} \mathrm{Res}\left(\frac{e^{-\xi}}{\prod_{k=1}^{p}(\beta E_k - \xi)^{d_k}}, \xi = \beta E_j\right). \tag{C.8}$$

Then, can write:

$$Z^{SG} = \sum_{k=1}^{p} e^{-\beta E_k} F_k, \tag{C.9}$$



Figure C1. Representation of the integration region Γ in the complex plane. The poles are represented in blue.

where

$$F_k = -(2\pi)^n e^{\beta E_k} \frac{1}{(d_k-1)!} \left[\frac{\partial^{d_k-1}}{\partial \xi^{d_k-1}} \left(e^{-\xi} \prod_{\substack{s=1 \\ s\neq k}}^{p} \frac{1}{(\beta E_j - \xi)^{d_j}} \right) \right] \Bigg|_{\xi=\beta E_k} . \tag{C.10}$$

By computing the integral we obtain

$$F_k = -\frac{(2\pi)^n}{(d_k-1)!} \sum_{\substack{j_0,\cdots,j_p=1 \\ j_0+j_1+\cdots j_p=d_k-1}}^{d_k-1} \binom{d_k-1}{j_0,\cdots,j_s} \prod_{\substack{s=1 \\ s\neq k}}^{p} \frac{(-1)^{j_0} d_s(d_s+1)\cdots(d_s+j_s-1)}{(\beta E_j - \beta E_k)^{d_s+j_s}}, \tag{C.11}$$

where $\binom{d_k-1}{j_0,\cdots,j_s}$ represents the multinomial coefficient

$$\binom{d_k-1}{j_0,\cdots,j_s} = \frac{(d_k-1)!}{j_0!\cdots j_s!},$$

and this concludes the proof.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Prof. Mario Floría for several enlightening discussions which guided us in the right direction. This work has been supported by the research grants E24/1, E24/2 and E24/3 (DGA, Spain), UZ2012-CIE-06 (Banco Santander and UZ), MinEco grant FPA2012-35453 and ARAID and Ibercaja grant for young researchers (Spain).

Bibliography

[1] E. Schrödinger. *Statistical thermodynamics*. Courier Dover Publications, 1967.
[2] A I Khinchin. *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Statistics*. Dover Books on Mathematics Series. Graylock, 1960.
[3] L D Landau and E M Lifshitz. Statistical Physics. Volume 5 of Course of Theoretical Physics. Translated from the Russian by E. Peierls and RF Peierls, 1959.
[4] J. L. Alonso, A Castro, J Clemente-Gallardo, J C Cuchí, P Echenique, and F Falceto. Statistics and Nosé formalism for Ehrenfest dynamics. *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.*, 44(39):395004, September 2011.
[5] J. L. Alonso, J. Clemente-Gallardo, J. C. Cuchi, P. Echenique, and F. Falceto. Ehrenfest dynamics is purity non-preserving: A necessary ingredient for decoherence. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 137(5):054106, 2012.
[6] J Von Neumann. *Mathematical principles of quantum mechanics*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1955.
[7] D. C. Brody and L. P. Hughston. The quantum canonical ensemble. *J. Math. Phys.*, 39(12):6502–6508, 1998.
[8] D. C. Brody, D. W. Hook, and L. P. Hughston. Microcanonical distributions for quantum systems. *Arxiv Prepr.*, page 16 pages, June 2005.
[9] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody, and D. W. Hook. Solvable model of quantum microcanonical states. *J. Phys. A. Math. Gen.*, 38(38):L607–L613, September 2005.
[10] G Jona-Lasinio. Invariant measures under Schrödinger evolution and quantum statistical mechanics. *Can. Math. Soc. Conf. Proc.*, 20:239–242, 2000.
[11] G. Jona-Lasinio and C. Presilla. On the statistics of quantum expectations for systems in thermal equilibrium. *AIP Conf. Proc. 844*, 844:200–205, 2006.
[12] J. Naudts and E. v. d. Straeten. A generalized quantum microcanonical ensemble. *J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp.*, 2006(06):P06015–P06015, June 2006.
[13] S. Goldstein, J. L. Lebowitz, R. Tumulka, and N. Zanghì. On the Distribution of the Wave Function for Systems in Thermal Equilibrium. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 125(5-6):1193–1221, December 2006.
[14] B. Fresch and G. J. Moro. Emergence of equilibrium thermodynamic properties in quantum pure states. I. Theory. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 133(3):034509, July 2010.
[15] B. Fresch and G. J. Moro. Typicality in Ensembles of Quantum States: Monte Carlo Sampling versus Analytical Approximations. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 113(52):14502–14513, 2009.
[16] B. V. Fine and F. Hantschel. An alternative to the conventional micro-canonical ensemble. *Phys. Scr.*, T151:014078, November 2012.
[17] K. Ji and B. V. Fine. Nonthermal Statistics in Isolated Quantum Spin Clusters after a Series of Perturbations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 107(5):050401, July 2011.
[18] M. Campisi. Quantum fluctuation relations for ensembles of wave functions. *New J. Phys.*, 15(11):115008, November 2013.
[19] L. Campos Venuti and P. Zanardi. Probability density of quantum expectation values. *Phys. Lett. A*, 377(31-33):1854–1861, October 2013.
[20] K. Huang. *Statistical Mechanics-Second Edition*. John Wiley and Sons, N. York, 1987.
[21] L E Reichl. *A modern course in statistical physics*. Wiley, 1998.
[22] H. B. Callen. *Thermodynamics & An introduction to Thermostatistics*. John Wiley & Sons, 2006.
[23] R B Griffiths. *Consistent Quantum Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
[24] P. C. Hohenberg. Colloquium: An introduction to consistent quantum theory. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 82(4):2835–2844, October 2010.
[25] E. T. Jaynes. Information Theory and Statistical Mechanics II. *Phys. Rev*, 108(2):171–190, 1957.

[26] C. A. Fuchs. *Distinguishability and Accessible Information in Quantum Theory*. Phd thesis, New Mexico, 1995.

[27] C. Cafaro and P. van Loock. Towards an entropic analysis of quantum error correction with imperfections. *AIP Conf. Proc. 1553*, 275:275–281, 2013.

[28] M A Nielsen and I L Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

[29] A Peres. *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*. Fundamental Theories of Physics. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1995.

[30] K. Maruyama, N. Franco, and V. Vedral. Colloquium : The physics of Maxwell ' s demon and information. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 81(March):1–23, 2009.

[31] S. W. Kim, T. Sagawa, S. De Liberato, and M. Ueda. Quantum Szilard Engine. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 106(7):070401, February 2011.

[32] M. Plesch, O. Dahlsten, J. Goold, and V. Vedral. Comment on "Quantum Szilard Engine". *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 111(18):188901, October 2013.

[33] S. W. Kim, K-H. Kim, T. Sagawa, S. De Liberato, and M. Ueda. Kim et al. Replay. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 111(18):188902, October 2013.

[34] Giovanni Gallavotti. Nonequilibrium and irreversibility. *ArXiv:1311.6448*, November 2013.

[35] A. Wehrl. General properties of entropy. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 50(2):221–260, April 1978.